

REMARKS

Currently claims 1, 3-7 and 9 are pending in the application.
Claims 1, 3-7 and 9 stand rejected.

By this amendment, applicants have amended claim 1 to change
“first location” to “user location”.

Claims 1, 3-7 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as
being unpatentable over Fredlund et al. (US Pat. No. 5666215) in view of Ueno et
al. (US Pat. No. 6483609).

As the Examiner points out Fredlund et al., at column 8, lines 28-
44 describe a system wherein a digital image center serves a number of photo
processing laboratories. The photo processing labs scan film and produce high
resolution digital images which are delivered to the digital image center. The
photo processing labs also produce low resolution versions of the digital images
which are sent to the customer's computer via a communication link. The user
selects images and products, and these selections are communicated to the digital
image center, where the high resolution images already reside. The high
resolution images are converted at the digital image center to the required
resolution for the selected products.

Contrast this with claim 1. In claim 1, the high resolution digital
image used to produce the image bearing product resides at the user location. In
Fredlund et al. the high resolution digital image used to produce image bearing
products is stored at the digital image center and never resides at the user location.
See col. 8, lines 45-63 of Fredlund et al.

In claim 1, a user selects one of the image bearing products, and
the service provider communicates the resolution required for the selected image
bearing product to the user location. In Fredlund et al., the resolution required for
the image bearing product is not sent to the user location since the user does not
have the high resolution image. Rather, the high resolution image is already
stored at the digital image center, so there is no need to communicate the
resolution required. There is a need in the claimed invention, since the resolution
required is used to convert the high resolution digital image to a lower resolution
digital image needed for the selected image bearing product. Clearly, there is no

motivation in Fredlund et al. to convert a high resolution digital image to a lower resolution digital image at a user location, in response to a communication from a service provider concerning the resolution required for a selected image bearing product. It is believed that Fredlund et al. actually teach away from the present invention. The reason for this is that there is no teaching in Fredlund et al. of communicating the resolution required for creating a selected image bearing product from one location to another. Moreover, there is no teaching for converting a high resolution digital image to a lower resolution digital image required for creating a selected image bearing product and then communicating this lower resolution digital image from one location to another. The reason for this is that the digital image center already has the high resolution digital image which will be converted to the required resolution for producing the selected image bearing product.

Ueno et al provide a system to efficiently transmit, for example by facsimile, compound documents that contain images, text, and line art. In the sections cited by the Examiner, and in Fig. 3, it is clear that document is separated into different types of data, such as photo data and line art data. These two different types of data are converted to different resolutions and compressed using different types of compression. However, there is no teaching that the resolution used for these different types of data depends on a product selected by a user. Moreover, there is no communication between any two locations in Ueno et al. of the required resolution for any portion of the compound document.

Applicants fail to see how Ueno et al can be reasonably combined with Fredlund et al to produce the subject matter of claim 1. Claim 1 is believed to define unobvious subject matter, and should be allowable. The remaining claims all depend upon claim 1 and should be allowed along with it.

It is believed that these changes now make the claims clear and definite and, if there were any problems with these changes, Applicants' attorney would appreciate a telephone call.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that none of the references, taken singly or in combination, disclose the claimed invention. Accordingly, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, the notice of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 22,363

Raymond L. Owens/djw
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-477-4653
Facsimile: 585-477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.